At the Supreme Court, P. 2

The Booby-Traps and Gimmicks Which Endanger A Nuclear Test Suspension Pact, Page Three

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 35 SEPTEMBER 8, 1958 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Why the Chinese 7th Fleet Is In Long Island Sound

China's first line of defense is on Long Island. We are honor bound to support on that island the only legitimate American government, that of Herbert Hoover, who was forced from the mainland by Democratic subversion in 1932.

Staten Island admittedly is in a different category. Our Congress, in authorizing war at any time in defense of Long Island, wisely left it to the discretion of the President to determine at the time of any attack whether it was also in our interest to defend Staten Island and Martha's Vineyard.

Still Long for His Return

Since that declaration by Congress both offshore islands have become more important to the defense of Long Island and to Mr. Hoover's hope of reconquering the mainland where his picture is said to be displayed openly at the Banker's Club, the Union League and other popular rallying places.

Mr. Hoover's Republicans have deployed about a third of their strength on Staten Island and Martha's Vineyard. From the former they have cut off almost all shipping into the Port of New York while the forces on Martha's Vineyard harass the Port of Boston.

An Unfriendly Response

The unfriendly nature of the Democratic regime has been demonstrated by its response to these developments. The Voice of America has been threatening Long Island. Staten Island has been bombarded from the mainland.

Wars have often occurred in the past because great Powers failed to make clear the point at which they would fight. We have put the regime in Washington on notice that any attack on Long Island would be an attack on China.

At the same time we have no intention of making Washington's military planning easier by letting it know in advance what we will do if the Americans try to seize the offshore islands. We are also going to keep them guessing as to whether American aggression against Staten Island will bring massive atomic retaliation against New York. Some nervousness in other countries is we suppose natural but the free world may rest assured that all these questions will be answered in good time by our great leader, who is keeping in close touch with the situation from the Peking golf links.

Can 170,000,000 People Be "Ignored"?

In the process of determining its policy toward the United* States, China has taken into account the various statements and arguments advanced by proponents of extending diplomatic recognition to Washington. One of the most commonly advanced reasons for recognition is that reality must be "recognized" and 170,000,000 people cannot be "ignored."

While superficially appealing, both statements themselves overlook the realities of the situation. Chinese policy is, of course, based on full appreciation of the fact that the American Democratic regime is currently in control of the mainland.

Our attitude toward the people of the United States remains what it historically has been, one of sympathetic understanding; our Confucian missionaries long labored among them and are ready to return any time they overturn their present Godless and materialistic regime. It is an earnest of our enduring friendship that Long Island sits on the Security Council of the United Nations, wielding a veto as one of the five great powers of the earth.

Statesmen at Work

"Our first line of defense is on Formosa."
—Harry S. Truman.

"As far as I am concerned, they can keep on guessing."
—James C. Hagerty.

"I think that there can be no atomic—that there are, it is—I shouldn't say, 'I think.' It is not possible to use these weapons except with the specific authority of the President.

"Q. I thought, perhaps, isn't there an exception in the case of an immediate threat to the command?

"A. . . . if it is possible, I will take a look again, because there is one exception, but I don't believe it mentions atomic weapons: that if the United States itself or any of its armed forces are under attack, that they can use measures necessary for their defense, but I would have to make certain. My memory is not quite that good this morning."
—Eisenhower Press Conference, August 27.

Our Intelligence Agents Tell Us . . .

Moreover, the People's Republic of China is convinced that the American Democratic regime does not represent the true will of the American people but the fruits of a conspiracy by Franklin D. Roosevelt and his successors; our intelligence agents, who watch events in the interior closely, tell us that guerrilla forces of the NAACP led by a Negro named Faubus have already seized control of Arkansas.

Thus our policy of withholding recognition is in actuality in the ultimate interests of the American people. China holds the view that Democracy's rule in the United States is not permanent and that it one day will pass.

By withholding recognition from Washington, and keeping our Embassy in Mr. Hoover's splendid capital in Rockville Center, we hope to hasten that passing.

* Any resemblance between what follows and the wording of the U. S. policy statement on non-recognition of Communist China (August 9) is not purely coincidental.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why Didn't Attorney General Rogers (Unlike Brownell) Sign That School Brief?

More Eloquence on Little Rock Outside the Court Than Within

Nothing said within the crowded Supreme Court chamber during the Little Rock appeal was as moving as the line which waited outside. Within, except for certain deeper reverberations in the Solicitor General's argument, the tone of the pleadings was conversational, almost casual; the transcript (so enterprisingly published next day by the *New York Times*) had an almost bumbling formlessness. The eloquence was in the quiet line outside. It began to form at 3:30 a. m. when a local Negro lawyer, with a name of tragic memory, Matthew Till, began the long wait in the dark at the top of the broad white marble stairs. He was joined a half hour later by a local Negro preacher, the Rev. Samuel W. Clark. The third in line, the first white man, appeared at 5:30 a. m. He was Leo Roos, a lawyer from New Orleans, who told me later he was for integration. The fourth to arrive was a Negro timid about giving his name. The fifth and sixth in line were from Arkansas, white, two young men, students at the State University in Fayetteville, from the northwestern hill country of the State, and both for integration. By 7 a. m. there were 50 people waiting. By 11 a. m., when the doors of the courtroom were finally opened to admit a scant 50, there were almost 600 in line, somewhat more than half Negro. Though the police kept telling them it was hopeless to wait, at least 200 were still standing there at 2 p. m. They stayed on as if their mere presence might, as lawyers say, pray the Court. It was a grave assemblage, and one felt shy in looking it over, knowing what was in the heart of every Negro there, and most of the whites. It was as if we all waited for the final promulgation of a new Emancipation, this time for children and from a no less cruel bondage, that they might no longer be made to feel ashamed, from that very first day on the way to school, separate from others and unequal, irrevocably less than other men.

Afraid of Being Identified?

In an editorial the morning after the argument, the *New York Times* noted that President Eisenhower "has been criticized for what seemed to be a justification of delay." But it found comfortingly, after what must have been a prolonged search, that he "has, however, identified himself" with the brief filed by the Department of Justice. The identification would seem to be less than letter perfect since Mr. Eisenhower Wednesday suggested that the Court should go slower while the brief filed next morning by the Department of Justice urged it to go faster; if the Court had followed the recommendation of the Department it would have decided the case on the merits at once without further argument. It seems that one cannot even be sure that the Attorney General, much less the President, is identified with the Department's brief. Ordinarily, in important appeals to the Supreme Court, the Attorney General's name appears on the brief along with the other lawyers in the Department who worked on it. In this case the brief was signed by J. Lee Rankin as Solicitor General, by Oscar H. Davis, Philip Elman and Ralph S. Spritzer as assistants to the Attorney General, and by Seymour Farber. The name of William P. Rogers as Attorney General was missing. Curious, we phoned the Justice Department to ask whether Herbert Brownell as Attorney General had signed the two briefs filed by the Department on argument and reargument of the original school four years ago. Those earlier briefs, reluctantly exhumed from the files, showed they were signed by Attorney General Brownell as well as by the Solicitor General and his aides. Did Mr. Rogers think it impolitic to identify himself too closely with his own Department's brief?

How Not to Deal With Bank Robberies

Mr. Thurgood Marshall complained to the Supreme Court that you don't deal with bank robberies by closing down the banks. The most striking sections of the government's brief were those which showed how few, how easily identifiable and how readily jailed were the "robbers" of the public peace inside and outside the Central High School in Little Rock. The Solicitor General argued that while it might be true that there was "deep-seated popular opposition" to integration in Little Rock, the active instigators of trouble were a handful of individuals and organizations. They were named by the School Board in response to interrogatories in the District Court and could be dealt with by injunction and contempt proceedings as were similar elements earlier when integration was successfully enforced in Hoxie, Arkansas. In the same way, the government's brief points out, evidence in the lower court shows it was a small group of no more than 25 students who caused the trouble within the school. Only two of these trouble-makers were expelled. "There is not the slightest suggestion," the brief said, "that the colored children did anything to incite violence or disorderly conduct." The proper remedy within and without the school "was one directed at the obstructionists, not in their favor." What the government's brief did not say was that the Federal government might have moved in boldly and tamed the mob by punishing the ringleaders for interfering with the orders of a Federal court. To say that would have been to indict Mr. Rogers and Mr. Eisenhower. That would be too much to ask even of the bravest Solicitor General.

Fulbright's Plea for Delay

We read with close attention the brief filed in the Supreme Court by Senator Fulbright, who has the unhappy role of being an Oxford-educated intellectual representing a Southern State. We wondered what he would say in asking the Court to grant Little Rock more delay. His brief was literate and scholarly, almost eloquent in its counsel of despair. He warned against the "congenital optimism" with which Americans generally confront social problems. He emphasized the irrationality and "certain pathological aspects" in the Southern situation, pictured both races as prisoners (though he did not say, of course, that only one is imprisoned in inferior status) and quoted the philosopher Morris Cohen on the foolishness of Cato who "would adhere to the law though the Republic be thereby destroyed." He thought the problem of integration "more likely to yield to the slow conversion of the human heart." The underdog, in short, must go on being patient until his masters have miraculously been converted; the oppressed must walk softly because the oppressor, if disturbed, becomes violent and irrational.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Booby Traps and Gimmicks Which Endanger A Test Suspension Agreement

Ike's Little Noticed Admission We Still Adhere to the Arms "Package"

The astute James Reston of the *New York Times* asked Mr. Eisenhower at press conference August 28 whether in the light of the agreement by the scientists at Geneva on testing we had revised our disarmament policy "or are we still standing on the last policy placed before the Russians about a year ago?"

Too little attention has been paid to this question and answer. Mr. Eisenhower replied that "the principle of the policy has not been abandoned at all." We were prepared to stop tests for a year "but we did couple that with . . . the policy . . . that we believe in, that the cessation of tests must be related to the cessation of production of this material for weapons purposes, and even further on to that eventually." This confirms our story last week, already on the press before that conference, which warned that U. S. policy was still adhering to the complex package proposal of August, 1957, and that we were still unwilling to separate testing from other issues as Stassen so long urged.

The Gimmicks in Small Type

This was indeed clear from the text of Mr. Eisenhower's statement of August 22 on suspending tests. The offer was for a year-to-year suspension conditional on (1) our continued satisfaction with the working of the inspection system and (2) that "satisfactory progress is being made in reaching agreement on and implementing major and substantial arms control measures such as the United States has long sought." The linkage with the broader disarmament package was made unmistakable when Mr. Eisenhower went on to say that any agreement on testing would be significant only "if it leads to other and more substantial agreements relating to limitation and reduction of fissionable material for weapons and to other essential phases of disarmament." This was the small type not visible in the headlines.

Testing Alone Not Significant?

This deserves a close reading. It means first of all that U. S. policy still regards a cessation of testing as of no significance in itself but only as a first step toward other agreements. This runs counter to the accepted scientific view that testing in itself adds to the health and genetic hazards of mankind. It runs counter to the widely accepted observation that a cessation of testing would have value in lessening tension and in stopping the development of new horrors for human slaughter. It runs counter, finally, to the view held by many in the Senate and elsewhere that since the U. S. is ahead in the number of tests and in nuclear weapons development, it stands to gain an advantage by cessation of tests now. A thorough and continued national debate on these issues is important if agreement is to be reached.

If progress is to be made, it is also important to bring pressure to bear for a breaking up of the disarmament "package." Not that the other objectives of the package are not worthwhile aims, especially the cessation of nuclear production for weapons purposes. But if each step depends on every other, we open the way to a circular wrangle made to order for those who do not want any kind of disarmament agreement at all. With this danger in mind it is essential for those interested to go back and study the Western package proposal as published August 29, 1957. To study it is to see how closely the new proposal by the President resembles the old one. Last year's proposal called for a 12-month cessation of testing from the date of a general disarmament convention, provided agreement had been reached on inspection. At the end of 12 months, there was to be another 12-month suspension if each of the parties was satisfied with preparations for the more difficult task of setting up an inspection system to police cessation of nuclear production for weapons purposes. If no such inspection system had been established 2 years after the disarmament convention had gone into effect, everybody would be free to begin testing again.

Remember? The Nuclear Give-Away Bill Was to Win British Acceptance Of Test Cessation?

"It is in the general interest to stop all testing immediately. Yet the British Government refuses to recognize its special responsibility in nuclear disarmament. Indeed, the suggested date for negotiations [Oct. 31] was specifically chosen to allow ourselves to carry out our new series of tests in the Pacific."

—The London Observer, August 24.

Testing Possible Indefinitely

The framers of the package were so anxious to continue testing that the August, 1957, plan even envisages continued agreement on other aspects of disarmament while testing continues indefinitely. Section V E of the formal proposals provides for continued testing (if cessation of production cannot be policed) subject only to the requirement that each testing nation announce in advance the dates for each testing series and the amount of energy to be released, "provide for limited observation . . . and limit the amount of radioactive material to be released into the atmosphere." Thus from the Russian point of view they might be opening their country to international inspection, and therefore to intelligence preparations for bombing in a future war, only to have these escape clauses used to resume testing two years later.

Full of Booby Traps

One more point needs to be noticed. Mr. Eisenhower spoke in his formal proposal of August 22 this year (as quoted above) of linking nuclear disarmament and cessation of testing "to other essential phases of disarmament." All this was spelled out in detail by the package proposal of last year. But in that package, progress on non-nuclear disarmament is made dependent on "progress toward the solution of political issues" (I, D, 2). These political issues are nowhere specified. This could be utilized to make reunification of Germany on Western terms or a Formosa settlement on our terms a pre-condition for disarmament.

In short, this package has been ingeniously equipped with so many booby-traps and escape hatches that its abandonment would seem to be a necessary first condition for progress. The package seems to have been constructed by Mr. Dulles with no tool other than a legal corkscrew.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New York State's Election Campaign Opens A New Page in U. S. History

For the First Time A Rich Boy, Too, Can Hope to Be President

The earlier leaders of our country were gentlemen born, members of the landed gentry in the South or of the wealthy merchant and professional classes of the North. It was not until Jackson's election in 1828 that the country first picked a President who had come up from poverty. With his election and the abolition of property-owning restrictions on the right to vote, American politics became democratic. The Whigs, spokesmen for the rich and well-born, got back into power in 1836 by nominating the first Presidential candidate who could boast of having been born in a log cabin while their campaign orators attacked Jackson's heir, Van Buren, as an Eastern aristocrat who put cologne on his whiskers.

From "TR" to Truman

For more than a century thereafter it has not only been an axiom of our politics that any poor boy might become President but that no rich boy could. In the world's most successful capitalist system, no capitalist was ever elected President. The masters of the great American fortunes not only had to keep out of sight politically, but were the whipping boys of every campaign. From Teddy Roosevelt through Woodrow Wilson to Truman's whistle-stop campaigns, "malefactors of great wealth" and "big business" were favored targets.

The current campaign in New York State opens a new page in our politics. The heads of both major party tickets are multi-millionaire capitalists while the surviving vermiform appendix of the Left, a new "United Socialist" ticket, must be content with a mere millionaire. The names which head all three tickets were dirty words in American politics a generation ago. Rockefeller and Harriman were leading "robber barons" while Lamont was Thomas W. Lamont, the right hand man of the No. 1 ogre, J. P. Morgan himself, there in his lair at Broad and Wall. John D.'s grandson, Nelson, and Edward H. Harriman's son, Averill, in running for the Governorship of New York are also running hopefully for the Presidency of the United States. That a Rockefeller and a Harriman could hope to be President would have been incredible a half century ago, as would their politics. For while they, unlike Thomas Lamont's son, Corliss, have never been called upon to deny membership in the Communist party, both Rockefeller and Harriman pride themselves on being within their respective parties left of center.

The change is not just a miracle of press agentry, though Madison Avenue has tried hard to metamorphose them nauseatingly into "Rock" and "Ave." If no hot breath of protest any longer pursues their names, it is largely because the New Deal not only succeeded in creating a newly satisfying security for the poorer classes but in demonstrating that the kings of capital, too, had to become constitutional monarchs if they were not to lose their thrones. It is because the underprivileged no longer feel—or are—so underprivileged that a Rockefeller can be an object of curiosity rather than hate. In this respect, though we dislike both major party tickets, we welcome the change. Whatever helps men to live together with less hatred is all to the good.

A Great Liberal Judge Steps Down

On October 20, his 70th birthday, Henry W. Edgerton will step down as Chief Judge of the U. S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in accordance with a new law requiring all chief judges to give up administrative duties at the age of 70.

Fortunately Judge Edgerton will remain on the bench. He was appointed to the Circuit Court by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1937. FDR never made a wiser judicial choice. Judge Edgerton has been one of the great liberal judges of our time, steadfast even during the worst days of the cold war and of McCarthyism.

Judge Edgerton's eloquent dissenting opinion in Barsky v. U. S. was long an isolated landmark of judicial protest on First Amendment grounds against the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Supreme Court's Watkins decision, though much less clear, has since made it law. Publication of Judge Edgerton's main opinions in book form is long overdue; they belong to the literature of the free society. We respectfully salute the Judge's birthday and hope he will remain many years more on the bench.

Norman Thomas and IFS to Speak at Nuclear Rally, Judson Church, 55 Wash. Square, NYC, 8 P. M., Sept. 8

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional: s/s/ss

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.
NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED